

**STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKING GROUP MEETING

Wednesday, April 29, 2025 - 1:30 p.m.

Teleconference Line: 1 669 900 6833

Meeting ID: 865 5156 88945

Passcode: 914552

Members Present

Nancy Olsen, Chair
Edward Estipona, Vice Chair
Drazen Elez
Robert Fink
Arianna Florence
Armando Leiva
Brett Miller
David Schmidt
Dr. Tiffany Tyler Garner
Michael Yoder

Others present

David Gardner
Kam Green
Tiffany Vazquez
Benny Wilson

1. **CALL TO ORDER - OPENING REMARKS**
Chair Olsen called the meeting to order at 1:35pm.
2. **ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM**
Tiffany Vazquez of OWINN took roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.
3. **VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC NOTICE POSTING**
Tiffany Vazquez verified that the meeting had been publicly posted pursuant to Nevada Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.
4. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S) NOTICE**

None
5. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY - Welcome and Introductions**

Brief introductions were made, including their name and connection to the workforce system.
6. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY - Review of strategies in the State Plan**

Chair Olsen went over the current state plan and asked if there were any thoughts or questions.

David Schmidt expressed concern about the long list of strategies, questioning how many will be effectively implemented and whether efforts will be focused on carrying them out or just continuing with the same activities. He suggested narrowing the focus to improve common intake and processes, emphasizing that not everything in the system needs to be part of the strategic plan.

Drazen Elez suggested evaluating the effort required to accomplish certain strategies and whether the outcomes justify the resources needed. Drazen expressed concerns about potential barriers it might create, such as delays in accessing services. He emphasized the need to assess the feasibility of implementing ideas, considering funding, infrastructure, and the overall positive impact on the community.

Arianna Florence agreed that the list appears overwhelming but suggested focusing on three main objectives. She proposed either reviewing each individual item for alignment or starting fresh to determine alignment with the overarching goals, emphasizing that the three main objectives should be the focus, not the numerous individual items.

Vice Chair Estipona suggested viewing the issue from a different perspective, considering that a simple single intake could be as basic as a Google form that produces a CSV file for integration into individual systems. However, he acknowledged the complexity due to differing systems and the associated costs. He emphasized the importance of fixing the system properly, rather than based on past assumptions or outdated methods.

Chair Olsen mentioned they are working on an interface that will communicate between Titles 1, 2, and 3. The interface will be in real time.

Brett Miller noted that collaboration and alignment are closely related and suggested that combining them could help identify a third objective if only three are to be selected.

Kam Green agreed with Brett. She highlighted the importance of distinguishing between tasks and strategic oversight. She also inquired about the strategic plan scorecard, seeking clarification on the color-coded statuses, particularly red for "not started or off track" and yellow for "in progress."

7. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY - Review of Strategic Plan 2024-2027 published last year**

Chair Olsen stated that no coordinated efforts have been made with the strategic plan since its publication. The goals identified were population, engagement, and alignment. There were items assigned under the goals to people that were not part of the process. There were unrealistic deadlines.

8. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Review and vote on whether to revise the Current Strategic Plan or create a new one**

Chair Olsen, Brett Miller, Dr. Tiffany Tyler Garner, and Michael Yoder voted to revise the plan.

Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner asked, “do we have infrastructure or resources for the measurements and strategies proposed?”

Chair Olsen noted that many elements in both the State Plan and the Strategic Plan involve activities that are being done, but not necessarily on a system-wide scale.

David Schmidt asked “if revised, would it be used? If not, would there be something we would use?”

Vice Chair Estipona suggested addressing each item individually, emphasizing the need for the right people to be involved in discussions to fully understand the scope and reach agreement. Once each item is tackled, he stressed the importance of defining accountability, as this is crucial for ensuring implementation. They proposed regular reporting back to the group to track whether the initiatives are being effectively used or not.

Chair Olsen called for a motion to revise Strategic Plan. **It was moved by Vice Chair Estipona and seconded by Drazen Elez. The motion passed.**

Kam Green emphasized the importance of tracking and collecting data on outcomes during the revision process. She highlighted that many are working on raising awareness about resources like vocational rehabilitation and workforce services, but the data collection and coordination around this work are lacking. She suggested incorporating a method to capture these efforts, perhaps through polls or reports in meetings, to gauge success and engagement. Kam stressed that moving forward, data collection should be a priority to measure progress and ensure accountability in the strategic plan.

Chair Olsen viewed the plan as an implementation tool to track and support progress on the State Plan. She suggested the group first identify which goals from the current list and the State Plan should be retained moving forward.

Vice Chair Estipona emphasized the need to identify who is being served, ensure the most critical populations are being reached, evaluate communication strategies, and improve collaboration and consistency across the group.

Drazen Elez raised concerns about the lack of agency buy-in for executing the strategic plan, making system-wide implementation difficult. He questioned whether the plan is meant to simply reflect existing efforts with limited influence or to actively drive results across the system. Drazen emphasized the need for agency representatives to engage in the process, assess alignment with their work, and contribute to developing a coordinated strategy.

Arianna Florence agreed that alignment and collaboration should be combined - there were aspects of both that were different (aligning was more in terms of braiding funding at the system level whereas collaboration was how to assist a client together as a system when they come in seeking services)

The team discussed the creation of a shared calendar for workforce events. They considered involving various stakeholders, including nonprofits, chambers of commerce, and private businesses. The team also discussed the potential for a website to house this calendar, with some members suggesting that existing systems could be utilized. The importance of communication and coordination in the use of this calendar was emphasized, with a focus on avoiding scheduling conflicts and promoting efficiency. The team also discussed the need for a clear communication strategy to ensure the calendar's success.

David Schmidt addressed concerns about how it will be communicated and coordinated. He emphasized the importance of a clear strategy to promote the calendar as a useful resource for reaching target communities. It was noted that without ongoing use and reinforcement, the tool risks becoming ineffective. Its design should align with its intended purpose, as certain formats—such as a shared Outlook calendar—may not be suitable for broader outreach, particularly through social media.

Brett Miller returned to the topic of execution teams, with a suggestion to revise the format by clearly distinguishing between stakeholders and execution teams. Many individuals listed are external stakeholders, not those responsible for carrying out the work. It was noted that while OWINN is the appropriate organizational lead, branding concerns arise because OWINN does not directly serve individuals or businesses. EmployNV was identified as the brand that currently engages with businesses.

Vice Chair Estipona noted that while multiple state entities want recognition, this creates confusion for consumers who simply want one place to access services. A global calendar should be housed within a central hub, and EmployNV was identified as the most prominent and suitable option. The goal is to establish EmployNV as the go-to brand for employment-related services in Nevada, similar to how Indeed functions nationally. Once users enter through this hub, they can be directed to the appropriate services based on their needs.

David Schmidt suggested that OWINN could play a coordination role. OWINN is seen as a natural center for this effort. EmployNV is the logical access point for users, streamlining services in one place. OWINN's coordination across partners aligns with its intended role in the workforce system.

Tiffany Vazquez mentioned that there is a possibility to have a shared calendar on the OWINN website

Drazen Elez suggested a shared platform where partners can enter their own events to avoid placing the full administrative burden on one person. OWINN's role would be to monitor content for relevance and address any issues that arise.

Chair Olsen suggested a shared platform where partners can enter their own events to avoid placing the full administrative burden on one person. The designated owner's role would be to monitor content for relevance and address any issues that arise.

David Schmidt highlighted concerns about scams and lack of trust in job sources from feedback of a previous survey. Emphasis was placed on the importance of promoting verified, high-quality, and trustworthy resources.

Vice Chair Estipona added a key distinction between EmployNV and platforms like Indeed is that EmployNV offers both online resources and physical locations across Nevada, providing a level of trust and accessibility that other platforms do not.

Chair Olsen asked members to review the action items and strategies across all sections: Population, Engagement, and Alignment—to identify which are unrealistic, need adjustments, or should be removed. Suggestions should be noted directly on the document for discussion at the next meeting. Members should also consider whether the current format should be kept, modified, or replaced.

Vice Chair Estipona raised concerns about the current multi-column format being confusing, despite its intent to fit content on one page. He suggested simplifying the layout by focusing on a primary goal and strategy first, followed by secondary and subsequent goals if progress allows. Each goal should clearly define who is in charge and the timeframe.

If a goal isn't reached, it can be carried over to the next strategic plan. The group will become more efficient as they find a rhythm. He also asked, "how can we work faster without breaking open meeting laws?"

David Gardner clarified that Subcommittees must comply with open meeting laws, even if they consist of only three members. If no subcommittee is formed, a group of fewer than a quorum can discuss freely without restrictions. However, once a subcommittee is created and a quorum is present, the group must follow open meeting laws, especially if deliberation or action is involved. If the meeting is purely brainstorming without decision-making, it does not need to comply with open meeting laws, and all ideas can later be brought to the full board for discussion and voting. Subcommittees cannot narrow down ideas; only the full body can make those decisions. A meeting must have both a quorum and deliberation or action to be subject to open meeting laws. If there is no quorum or no deliberation/action, it is not required to follow these laws. A subcommittee, once created, must comply with open meeting laws. However, if three members meet informally without forming a subcommittee, they can discuss anything freely, create notes or reports, but cannot formalize it into a working group or task force.

9. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** - Start revisions with goal number 1 in both documents, "population"

Chair Olsen requested members to review the proposed strategies. A Word document will be sent out. Members were asked to add any comments or notes directly into the document.

10. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** - Discuss and determine future meeting schedule for working group

Chair Olsen called for a motion to have the next meeting on May 22, 2025, from 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm. **It was moved by Vice Chair Estipona and seconded by David Schmidt. The motion passed.**

11. **SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT(S)**

Chair Olsen asked for final public comment. There were none.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:09 pm.